

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

JAN 24 2008

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

CATHY A. CATTERSON, CLERK
U.S. COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

CHIH HSIN TENG,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

DEPARTMENT OF MOTOR
VEHICLES,

Defendant - Appellee.

No. 07-56086

D.C. No. CV-07-00639-CJC

MEMORANDUM*

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the Central District of California
Cormac J. Carney, District Judge, Presiding

Submitted January 14, 2008**

Before: HALL, O'SCANNLAIN, and PAEZ, Circuit Judges.

Chih Hsin Teng appeals pro se from the district court's order dismissing for lack of subject matter jurisdiction his action alleging that the California Department of Motor Vehicles improperly revoked his driver's license eleven

* This disposition is not appropriate for publication and is not precedent except as provided by 9th Cir. R. 36-3.

** The panel unanimously finds this case suitable for decision without oral argument. *See* Fed. R. App. P. 34(a)(2).

years ago. We have jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1291. *See Spurlock v. FBI*, 69 F.3d 1010, 1015 (9th Cir. 1995). We review de novo a district court’s dismissal based on the *Rooker-Feldman* doctrine. *Noel v. Hall*, 341 F.3d 1148, 1154 (9th Cir. 2003). We affirm.

The district court properly concluded that it lacked subject matter jurisdiction under the *Rooker-Feldman* doctrine because Teng’s federal action requires the district court to review and reverse numerous state court decisions refusing to reinstate Teng’s driver’s license or award him relief. *See Doe & Assocs. Law Offices v. Napolitano*, 252 F.3d 1026, 1029-30 (9th Cir. 2001) (no federal subject matter jurisdiction “[w]here the district court must hold that the state court was wrong in order to find in favor of the plaintiff[.]”).

Teng’s remaining contentions are unpersuasive.

AFFIRMED.